

IN THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figure 10 and a new sheet of drawings. Figure 10 is amended to change the name of the figure from Figure 10 to Figure 10A. The new drawings sheet includes a new Figure 10B.

REMARKS

Examiner Interview

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the courtesy of a telephone interview extended to Applicants' attorney, Justin Liu, on June 3, 2005. During the interview, no exhibit was shown and no demonstration was conducted. Claim 8 was discussed. It was agreed that Applicants would submit amended drawings to illustrate Claim 8.

Amendments to the Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). In particular, the Examiner stated that "the latches must be shown or canceled from claim 8." Office Action at page 2. In response thereto, Applicants have amended former Figure 10 to be new Figure 10A, and have added an additional drawing sheet with newly added Figure 10B. The amendment is fully supported by the specification as filed, for example in paragraph [0034] and in the claims as originally filed. A copy of newly labeled Figure 10A and additional Figure 10B is attached hereto.

Amendments to the Specification

Applicants have amended paragraphs [0018], [0027], [0031], and [0044] merely to reflect to change references to Figure 10 to references to Figure 10A. Applicants have further amended paragraph [0018] to reflect newly added Figure 10B, and have added a new paragraph [0048.1] that describes new Figure 10B. These amendments merely bring the specification into conformance with the amendments to the drawings described above, and are therefore fully supported by the specification as filed.

Summary of Claim Status

Claims 1-37 are pending in the present application after entry of the present amendment. Claims 17-34 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 9, 10, 35, and 36 are rejected for the reasons discussed below. Claims 11-16 and 37 are objected to as depending from a rejected base claim, but indicated as allowable if properly

rewritten in independent form. Claims 1-8 are allowed. Applicants thank the Examiner for this acknowledgement of patentable subject matter.

Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of the claims and withdrawal of the pending rejections and objections in view of the present amendment and in light of the following discussion.

Rejections for Double-Patenting

Claims 9 and 10 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over co-pending U.S. Application 10/661,016. In response, Applicants have enclosed herewith a terminal disclaimer for the present invention with respect to the cited application. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of Claims 9 and 10.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Shimada et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,726,990 (“Shimada”). Applicants respectfully disagree, however, Applicants submit that the rejection is moot in light of the amendments to Claim 35. In particular, Applicants have amended Claim 35 to recite that the first state of the clock select signal further corresponds to the width of parallel input data being of a first multiple and the second state of the clock select signal further corresponds to the width of the parallel input data being of a second multiple. Applicants submit that Shimada does not teach or even suggest the features of amended Claim 35, and thus Claim 35 is now in form for allowance. Claim 36 depends from Claim 35, and is therefore believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons.

Objections

Claims 1, 2, and 9 are objected to for certain informalities. Applicants thank the Examiner for his close reading of the claims. Applicants have amended Claims 1, 2,

and 9 to correct these minor inadvertent clerical errors in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objections.

Claims 11-6 and 37 are objected to as being dependent from a rejected base claim, but indicated as otherwise allowable. Applicants thank the Examiner for this acknowledgement of allowable subject matter.

Claims 11-16 depend from Claim 9, and thus include all of the limitations of Claim 9. Claim 37 depends from Claim 35, and thus includes all of the limitation of Claim 35. For the reasons set forth above, Applicants believe Claims 9 and 35 are allowable. Therefore, for at least the same reasons, Applicants believe Claims 11-16 and 37 are also allowable, and allowance of such claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicants acknowledge an unusually thorough and helpful analysis of all pending claims by the Examiner. No new matter has been introduced by any of the above amendments. In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants believe that Claims 1-16 and 35-37 are in condition for allowance, and allowance of the application is therefore requested. If action other than allowance is contemplated by the Examiner, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone Applicants' attorney, Justin Liu, at 408-879-4641.

Respectfully submitted,



Justin Liu
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 51,959

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on September 8, 2005.

Julie Matthews
Name



Julie Matthews
Signature